

REMARKS

In response to the election of species requirement the applicant provisionally elects species A for prosecution on the merits as referred to by the examiner in the last office action. The applicant further requests reconsideration of the election requirement (under CFR 1.143) and traverses all the species classified by the examiner. The applicant observes that the examiner has not provided reasons and/or examples to support the restriction as provided for by MPEP §803 and 35 U.S.C. 132 (a). This restricts the applicant to counter the reasons that the examiner has found sufficient to evoke a restriction. In context of the restriction, the applicant has determined that the claims readable on the elected species A are claims 1-31, 68-78, 93, 96, 99, 102, 105, 108, 111, 114, 117, 120, 123, 126, 129, 132 and 135.

Traversing the species A, B, C and D identified by the examiner, the applicant submits that the species are not patentably distinct as claimed by the examiner. As the examiner has not provided reasons and/or examples to support the restriction, the applicant can only ascertain the reasons by analyzing the figures on which the restriction is based. On the basis of the figures it is apparent that the examiner has separated the inventions based upon the configuration of conveyors in a sole of a shoe. The applicant submits that species B, C and D are obvious variants of species A. All species provide an increment in speed of walking, without affecting the normal walking action of the user. Further, all species are dependent on the same electromechanical support necessary for operation. As for the different configuration of the conveyor, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the conveyor configuration based upon conveyor mechanics and configurations in existing machines.

The applicant requests that if the examiner lists additional reasons and/or examples for restriction that the applicant has not ascertained from the present Office Action, the applicant be given further opportunity to traverse the species. In view of the foregoing

remarks and traverse, the applicant respectfully contends that the election requirements be withdrawn.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Raja Singh Tuli', is written over the printed name.

Raja Singh Tuli

Inventor